



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,630	06/30/2003	Jeffrey A. Aaron	190206-1150	1405

38823 7590 12/15/2005

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/
BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY
SUITE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339

EXAMINER

CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/611,630

Applicant(s)

AARON, JEFFREY A.

Examiner

Melissa M. Chojnacki

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 12-17 and 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burnett (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087408).

As to claims 1, Burnett teaches a method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043), comprising:

searching a database for a match between user input and information in the database (See abstract; paragraphs 0037-0038; paragraph 0041);

obtaining keywords resulting from the searching step (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019);

utilizing a database table to associate the keywords with potential services to sell to a customer (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019); and

producing a set of suggested actual services and associated information regarding services that can be sold to the customer (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 2 and 14, Burnett teaches associating the keywords with generically-defined services (See paragraphs 0015-0019; paragraph 0094; paragraph 0264); further comprising logic configured to associate the keywords with generically-defined services (See paragraphs 0015-0019; paragraph 0094; paragraph 0264).

As to claims 3, 15 and 33, Burnett teaches calculating appropriate services to offer the customer utilizing a weighted summation of technical appropriateness values associated with at least one of generic, potential, actual or available services; logic configured to calculate appropriate services to offer the customer utilizing a weighted summation of technical appropriateness values associated with at least one of generic, potential, actual or available services (See paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364); wherein the service suggestion analyzer is further configured to calculate appropriate services to offer the customer utilizing a weighted summation of technical appropriateness values associated with at least one of generic, potential, actual, or available services (See paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claims 4 and 16, Burnett teaches calculating preferential services to offer the customer utilizing a weighted summation of preference values associated with actual services offered by a service provider; logic configured to calculate preferential services to offer the customer utilizing a weighted summation of preference values associated with actual services by a service provider (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claims 5, 17, 23 and 34, Burnett teaches ranking potential generic services for presentment and comparison of preferential services; logic configured to rank potential services for presentment and comparison of preferential services (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364); logic configured to rank potential generic services for presentment and comparison of preferential services (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364); wherein the service suggestion analyzer is further configured to rank potential generic services for presentment and comparison of preferential services (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 6 and 30, Burnett teaches ranking potential actual services for presentment and comparison of preferential services (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364); wherein the service module is further configured to interface with the analyzer module to obtain the generic needs list and to produce a ranked set of suggested actual services offered by a service provider (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364).

As to claims 12 and 22, Burnett teaches outputting the suggested services and associated information to a user's processing device; logic configured to output the suggested services and associated information to a user's processing device (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 13, Burnett teaches a computer-readable medium (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043) comprising:

configured to search a database for a match between user input and information in the database (See abstract; paragraphs 0037-0038; paragraph 0041);

logic configured to obtain keywords resulting from the search (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019);

logic configured to utilize a database table to associate the keywords with potential services to sell to a customer (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019); and

logic configured to produce a set of suggested services and associated information of services that can be sold to customer (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 24, Burnett teaches a system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043), comprising:

a cyler configured to search through a plurality of databases to match user input with sales information in the databases and to provide keywords resulting from the search (See abstract; paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019; paragraphs 0037-0038; paragraph 0041); and

a service suggestion analyzer operatively coupled to the cyler, the service

suggestion analyzer configured to provide a set of potential services to be sold to a customer based on the keywords from the cycler (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 25, Burnett teaches wherein the service suggestion analyzer further comprises an analyzer module, a service module and an output module (See paragraph 0036-0043).

As to claim 26, Burnett teaches wherein the service suggestion analyzer further comprises a psychological assistant module and a special deals interface module (See paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043).

As to claim 27, Burnett teaches wherein the analyzer module is further configured to produce a prioritized and clustered needs list that includes generic services (See paragraph 015; paragraph 017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 28, Burnett teaches wherein the analyzer module is further configured to include a lookup table to provide the clustered needs list (See paragraph 0173; paragraph 0176; paragraph 0183; paragraph 0186; paragraph 0188; paragraph 0194).

As to claim 29, Burnett teaches wherein the analyzer module is further configured to perform technical weightings of potential services to prioritize the generic needs list (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364)

As to claim 31, Burnett teaches wherein the service module is further configured to incorporate stored preference weightings for an available offered service such that the set of suggested actual services are skewed towards services preferred to be sold by a service provider (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 32, Burnett teaches wherein the output module is operatively coupled to the service module and the output module is further configured to provide the ranked set of suggested actual services to a user via at least one of a user's display device of a processing device, auditory means including synthesized voice, email, or paging device (See paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-11, 18-21 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087408), in view of Lawrence et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780).

As to claims 7 and 18, Burnett does not teach calculating maximum and minimum thresholds such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria; configured to calculate maximum and minimum threshold such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria.

Lawrence et al. teaches autonomous citation indexing and literature browsing using citation context (See abstract), in which he teaches calculating maximum and minimum thresholds such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria (See column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48); configured to calculate maximum and minimum threshold such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria (See column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Burnett, to include calculating maximum and minimum thresholds such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria; configured to calculate

maximum and minimum threshold such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Burnett, by the teachings of Lawrence et al. because calculating maximum and minimum thresholds such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria; configured to calculate maximum and minimum threshold such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria would improve the method for finding relevant and important publications on the web (See Lawrence et al., column 1, lines 61-66).

As to claims 8 and 35, Burnett as modified, teaches calculating ratio checks such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48); wherein the service suggestion analyzer is further configured to calculate ratio checks such that preferential services offered by a service provider do not override technical security decision criteria (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

As to claims 9 and 19, Burnett teaches adjusting or reducing weighted

Art Unit: 2164

summation values if the threshold is violated; configured to adjust or reduce weighted summation values if the threshold is violated (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

As to claims 10 and 20, Burnett teaches discarding a particular preferential service if the threshold or ratio check is violated; configured to discard a particular preferential service if the threshold or ratio check is violated (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

As to claims 11 and 21, Burnett teaches calculating a comparison value by adjusting weighed summations for cases of service bundling; logic configured to calculate a comparison value by adjusting weighed summations for cases of service bundling (See Burnett, paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364; also see Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 9, 2005
Mmc



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER